

June 30, 1965

If they are interested in the past, they would know from history that those who have continued their aggression at the same time they laughed at the efforts of the United States to avoid conflict, invariably had ultimate cause to regret their actions.

It becomes steadily more evident that the greatest challenge to the future of this country is contained in the attitudes and actions of the Chinese. Let us hope that the policies and programs of the United States give full recognition to this development.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Louis B. Fleming, of the Los Angeles Times, from Algiers, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 28, 1965]

UNITED STATES SCORNED ON VIET BUILDUP
(By Louis B. Fleming)

ALGIERA, June 27.—Marshal Chen Yi, Foreign Minister of Communist China, today defied the United States to continue its buildup of military forces in Vietnam.

"I hope the United States sends in 2 million troops," he said.

"The bigger the intervention, the bigger the defeat will be," he added.

He was cool to any talk of negotiations and only laughed when asked to comment on President Johnson's proposal at the United Nations commemorative meeting last Friday for new initiatives for peace in southeast Asia through the United Nations.

Chen Yi was interviewed by U.N. correspondents, here for the postponed Afro-Asian conference, in the Palais du Peuple. Then he joined a state luncheon given for more than 400 diplomats and foreign ministers by the Algerian Foreign Minister, Addul Aziz Bouteflike.

The Chinese Foreign Minister declined to comment directly on reports that he had proposed bilateral negotiations solely between the regime in Saigon and North Vietnam. But he dismissed as nonexistent the Saigon regime.

"They represent no one," he said. "They have had 11 changes of government," he added.

NOT CHINA'S PROBLEM

He repeatedly said that the problem of Vietnam is not China's problem but the problem of the people of Vietnam.

"This is a national liberation movement," he said. "We do not speak for them."

Then, turning toward the nearby representative of the Vietcong, he added: "They are here. It is for the Vietnamese people to decide. Of course, we support them. This thing can end only with the independence of Vietnam and its unification. He was pressed twice on whether he was advocating solely a military solution, but he avoided a direct answer.

"If you are attacked, will you not counter-attack?" he asked, directing the remarks to a correspondent from India.

His responses on the question of negotiations appeared intentionally ambiguous.

The last question asked for his reaction to President Johnson's speech to the United Nations in San Francisco. He did not wait for the translation but laughed heartily, saying in an offhand manner, "There is nothing we can do about that here." Then he left for consultations with other ministers.

It was understood that Chen Yi will remain here for several more days. His confident remarks were in contrast with the general impression here that China had suf-

fered a setback in its leadership ambitions with the collapse of the conference.

If China gained anything, it appeared to be a warmer and closer association with Pakistan.

Pakistani Foreign Minister Bhutto flew here unexpectedly Saturday morning and immediately conferred with Chen Yi. Shortly thereafter, the two foreign ministers, joined by the foreign ministers of Syria, Egypt, Indonesia, and Mali, met with Bouteflike for almost 3 hours. From this meeting emerged the plan to postpone the conference and have the preparatory committee meet instead to issue a communique. Pakistan appears to have been a key instrument in this plan.

One immediate effect was to keep the control of the plans for the next meeting in the hands of this 16-nation committee in which China has a slight advantage of sympathy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

THE CRISIS IN THE U.N. AND THE QUESTION OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week we observed the 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

At the risk of violating the rules of etiquette which tend to govern such occasions, I wish to pose the proposition that on the 20th anniversary of the United Nations we who believe in it can best serve its cause not by blind Pollyanna statements, pretending that all is wonderful, but by a frank, critical examination of its strong points and its weaknesses, its accomplishments and its failures.

Those fundamentalist supporters of the United Nations who take the position that the United Nations is always right, and who resist criticism of the United Nations, no matter how restrained or how warranted, as something akin to treason, are, in reality, rendering the greatest disservice to the cause of the United Nations.

THE IDEAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I have been a supporter of the United Nations from its inception, and I have voted in the House and Senate for every measure submitted by the Administration for its support.

I believe profoundly in the United Nations and the ideals to which it is dedicated, as set forth in the United Nations Charter. The United Nations Charter, indeed, is one of the noblest and most significant documents ever penned by man.

Essentially, the charter calls for the rule of law in the relations between nations.

It commits the member nations to respect the dignity and worth of the human person and the equal rights of men and of nations.

It calls for respect for treaty obligations and other sources of international law.

It calls for the self-determination of peoples.

It stipulates that force is to be banished as an instrument of policy; and it authorizes the Security Council to take whatever action may be necessary

against nations guilty of aggression or of violating the peace.

With these principles, no reasonable person can disagree.

THE RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Nor can any reasonable person deny that the United Nations has a number of significant accomplishments to its credit.

The Security Council's discussion of Soviet military intervention in northern Iran in 1946 provided the moral background for President Truman's stern warning to Stalin which, in turn, led to the Soviet evacuation of Iranian soil.

Similarly, when the United Nations set up a committee to investigate the evidence that Communist guerrilla activity in Greece was inspired from Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, the report of this committee gave important assistance to the American rescue operation by indicting the Communist satellites in the eyes of world opinion.

United Nations intervention against Communist aggression in Korea must be considered an important part of the positive record.

The United Nations has unquestionably served the cause of peace in the Gaza Strip by throwing buffer forces between the Arab and Israeli armies.

The United Nations Special Committee on Hungary, the United Nations committee which visited West Borneo to ascertain the desires of its inhabitants, and the United Nations committee which visited Vietnam to investigate the accounts of the persecution of the Buddhist religion, have all functioned with complete impartiality and have produced reports and records of the greatest significance.

This is only part of the positive record.

But today, despite the lofty principles on which it is founded, despite its major accomplishments in a number of situations, despite the good will of the great mass of the free people of the world, the United Nations is passing through a crisis of survival.

THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

Most of the discussion in the press has centered on the United Nations' financial crisis. This, in itself, would be grave enough because the United Nations deficit has been growing with every passing year.

The Soviet Union and the satellite nations are primarily responsible for this deficit.

They have thus far refused to pay a single cent toward the United Nations peacekeeping operation in the Gaza Strip or toward the cost of the Congo operations.

Between them, the Communist nations are in arrears on their various assessments to the tune of some \$85 million.

Other nations are also heavily in arrears on their payments.

Needless to say, the United States, which alone provides almost 30 percent of the United Nations operating funds, is completely up-to-date on its payments.

If the United Nations' deficit continues to increase by \$20 or \$30 million a year, somewhere along the line it will either have to cease to operate or else cut back on its operations drastically.

June 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14773

Only the most rigid insistence that the member nations meet their obligations can save the United Nations from insolvency. I was pleased to note in this connection that the Department of State earlier this year notified the Communist bloc that unless they pay up on their arrears measures will be instituted to deprive them of their votes.

THE CRISIS OF PRINCIPLE

But as grave as the financial crisis may be, it is of minor importance compared to the growing crisis of principle which now afflicts the United Nations.

In situation after situation in recent years, member nations belonging to the Communist or Afro-Asia blocs have acted in open contravention of the United Nations Charter.

In situation after situation, the Afro-Asian and Communist nations, voting together, have substituted their arbitrary conceptions for the principles so clearly enunciated in the charter.

And, either by inaction or by active complicity, the United Nations has several times served as a force, not for the self-determination of peoples, but for their enslavement by alien imperialisms.

If the tendencies apparent in the United Nations in recent years are permitted to develop unchecked, if certain essential reforms are not instituted, if the United Nations does not return to the principles on which it was founded, then nothing can save the United Nations as originally conceived in San Francisco in 1945.

In its suppression of the Hungarian revolution, the Soviet Union not only flouted the United Nations Charter, but openly ignored 19 successive resolutions of the General Assembly.

But apart from the general resolutions of condemnation, nothing happened.

The United Nations Committee was refused admission to Hungary.

By way of reaction, the United Nations Special Committee on Hungary was dissolved, the question of Hungary was dropped from the agenda, the Committee on Hungary was disbanded, and 2 years ago the delegates of the Kadar quisling government were finally accredited, despite the official finding that this government has been imposed on the Hungarian people by Soviet bayonets.

The United Nations Charter has been openly flouted by India in its military action against Portuguese Goa. A very strong case could be made for Indian possession of Goa. But this fact in no way justifies the violation of the United Nations Charter to achieve possession.

Ambassador Stevenson spoke for the American people when he warned that this failure by the United Nations might be "the first act in a drama that could end in its death." But in the United Nations itself, Ambassador Stevenson's words fell on deaf ears.

Beyond manifesting our indignation, we did not dare to bring the matter to a vote in the General Assembly because there were clear indications that almost two-thirds of the Assembly would have supported India's action.

The United Arab Republic has openly flouted the charter by sending 50,000

troops into Yemen to impose a quisling regime on the Yemeni people.

But by the time this happened, in September, 1962, the process of erosion had already gone so far that no one in the United Nations dared raise the issue.

Instead of condemning the United Arab Republic's action, the United Nations, with, I regret, the supine support of the United States, morally sanctioned this act of aggression by calling upon both sides—the victorious Egyptian Army and the Yemeni Government in the mountains which is seeking to recover its country's lost freedom—to refrain from importing more arms.

India has denied self-determination to the people of Kashmir and has ignored resolutions of the General Assembly calling for a plebiscite to terminate the problem.

Indonesia has openly flouted the charter by its military commitment to the destruction of Malaysia and by mounting guerrilla invasions of Brunei and North Borneo. Indonesia has now left the United Nations. But this in no way alters the fact that the United Nations did nothing about Indonesian aggression.

Castro's Cuba has openly flouted the charter by its shipment of arms and ammunition to the Venezuelan terrorists and by its subversive activities through the hemisphere.

The United Arab Republic has repeatedly violated the spirit of the charter by its inflammatory propaganda calling for the overthrow of King Hussein of Jordan and by its repeated calls for the military destruction of the State of Israel.

I could go on and on listing action taken by the Communist nations or by members of the Afro-Asian bloc that are in clear contravention of the United Nations Charter.

The proof is overwhelming that only the United States and the minority of Western nations show respect for the charter and for the decisions of the General Assembly.

Instead of an organization committed to the rule of law and governed by a set of agreed principles, the United Nations has become an organization with no guiding principles, governed by an arbitrary majority that seeks to substitute its own will for the rule of law.

In large part, this situation is due to the rapidly growing membership of the United Nations. When the United Nations was founded in San Francisco, there were exactly 50 members. Today, in consequence of the rapid liquidation of the European colonial empires, 114 nations are represented in the General Assembly.

Some of the new member nations—in particular those that were properly prepared for independence by the colonial powers which previously governed them—have shown surprising maturity and responsibility. But many of the new member nations were ill-prepared or hardly prepared at all for independence. They do not understand the fundamental issues involved in the conflict between the free world and the Communist world; and they are too often prone to follow the

lead of the Communist world because of their residual resentment against Western colonialism.

In addition, they have been led to believe that violent attacks against Western colonialism pay off in the form of increased foreign aid, while attacks on Soviet colonialism are best avoided because the Soviets are quick to respond in anger and to take political and economic countermeasures.

Moreover, under U.N. voting procedures, minor Asian or Latin American nations and even an African nation of 500,000 still emerging from tribalism, has precisely the same vote as the United States and the Soviet Union.

In this grotesque U.N. calculus, one citizen of a minor and still backward country may become the equivalent of 100 Frenchmen or 400 Americans. And although many plans have been advanced for "weighting" votes by population and other factors, there is not the remotest chance that the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America will agree to anything less than the present formula of "one nation, one vote."

Under the stimulus of the growing Afro-Asian majority, acting in concert with the Communist bloc, the General Assembly in recent years has interpreted "self-determination" to mean self-determination for only African and Asian nations, no matter how small or backward or ill prepared for independence.

Apart from one or two passing references by the British and American delegations, no one any longer talks about the right of self-determination for Poland and Hungary and the other ancient nations of Europe that have fallen victim to Soviet imperialism.

Not even peoples of Afro-Asian stock have been exempt from the arbitrary interpretation of self-determination that has become current in the United Nations. This was dramatically demonstrated in the case of West New Guinea.

The Netherlands in the postwar period had been conscientiously preparing the Papuan people of West New Guinea for genuine independence.

But President Sukarno of Indonesia looked upon West New Guinea as a territory that belonged within an Indonesian imperialist empire.

He demanded that the territory be turned over to him, although the Papuan people had nothing in common racially or culturally, with the Indonesian people.

Refusing to submit the case to the International Court in The Hague, Sukarno threatened force if West New Guinea were not turned over to him and actually sent in commando units while the matter was still under discussion.

The people of West New Guinea were never consulted before the decision was made in the summer of 1962.

The dispute wound up with Sukarno completely triumphant and with the United Nations and the United States reduced to the role of accessories to an act of imperialist expansion that stood the United Nations Charter on its head.

14774

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 30, 1965

The United Nations again stood the charter on its head in its handling of the Congo crisis.

I believed in the desirability of a unified Congo, and I worked with President Kennedy and with the Department of State in attempting to promote a peaceful settlement of the Katanga dispute. I was dead opposed, however, to the successive military actions against Katanga because they were in complete violation of the United Nations Charter.

Indeed, I challenge anyone to defend the thesis that the United Nations has the right to intervene by force to compel the acceptance of a government of its choice or to support this government in suppressing elements who ask for a greater degree of autonomy or even for secession. The United Nations Charter could not be clearer on this point. Article II, paragraph 7, reads:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

I was also opposed to the United Nations action in the Congo because I feared that it would lead to nothing but chaos and disintegration.

This fear, unfortunately, was borne out by events.

Because virtually its entire effort was directed toward the overthrow of the Tshombe government in Katanga, all the United Nations had to show for its vast expenditure of money and effort in the Congo at the time it left was a continuing downward spiral of law and order and economic well-being in a country that is potentially the richest in Africa.

All it had to show for approximately \$400 million spent on the Congo operation was \$400 million worth of chaos.

When the United Nations forces left the Congo in June of last year, the country stood on the verge of a complete Communist takeover.

But fortunately for the cause of freedom in Africa, the solution which the United Nations had put together at such great cost and with so much blood, fell apart on the day of its departure.

The completely inept Adoula government, which had been installed under United Nations patronage and which owed its survival primarily to the United Nations, was dismissed; and, in its place, a new government was formed under the Premiership of Moise Tshombe, the man whom both the political and military representatives of the United Nations had fought so hard to destroy.

I think it is now commonly agreed that the Congo was saved from the catastrophe which threatened, thanks only to the courage and wisdom and determination of Prime Minister Tshombe.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

While the United Nations has shown itself to be completely ineffective in upholding the rule of law against the transgressions of the Communist states on the one hand and the Afro-Asian states on the other hand, while it has failed to intervene where it could and should have intervened, the United Nations Secre-

tariat and the majority of the General Assembly apparently seem bent on intruding themselves into the affairs of the American states, where their presence is not needed and not wanted.

I refer specifically to the situation in the Dominican Republic.

When it was first proposed that the United Nations set up its factfinding mission, Ambassador Stevenson strongly opposed the proposal on the grounds that this mission would be competitive with that of the OAS and that it would, by the nature of things, serve to undermine its authority and in this way hinder rather than promote a settlement.

When I spoke on the subject of the Dominican Republic this last May 24, I expressed my wholehearted concurrence in the reservations set forth by Ambassador Stevenson.

I consider it most regrettable that, despite these reservations, Ambassador Stevenson voted with the rest of the Security Council on May 14 to approve the Jordanian resolution calling on Secretary General U Thant to send a representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting on the situation.

I am opposed to the veto in principle. But as long as it exists on the books and as long as the Soviets continue to use it, on small issues and big issues, whenever their own interests are affected, I think that we should not hesitate to utilize the veto power in defense of our own interests, at least where issues of great importance are involved.

Our Government has made a very heavy commitment to the restoration of peace and order in the Dominican Republic. Because of our desire to function through the OAS and in harmony with them, we have subordinated our own substantial forces in the Dominican Republic to an OAS command, and we have agreed to channel our economic and financial assistance through the OAS.

Because of the continuing crisis in the Dominican Republic, I feel that we must resolutely oppose any effort to undermine or undercut the endeavors of the OAS to achieve a settlement there, no matter what the source of these efforts.

The fears expressed by Ambassador Stevenson have, regrettably, been more than justified by the record of the United Nations mission since its arrival.

From the moment of its arrival in the Dominican Republic, the United Nations mission entered into immediate conflict with Senor Mora, the head of the OAS mission, and with Ambassador Tapley Bennett.

Without taking any time to look into this complex situation, the United Nations mission established immediate contact with the Camacho rebels but avoided contact with the Imbert junta.

The reports they have sent out since that time have all been characterized by the same militant bias in favor of the Camacho-Bosch forces.

That this is so is not surprising for several reasons.

First of all, the dispatch of two competitive peacemaking teams to any crisis area violates all the rules of commonsense and diplomacy.

If the United Nations team has simply come to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of supporting and paralleling the efforts of the OAS team, there would be no justification for its existence.

And if the United Nations team has come to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of competing with the OAS representative, this creates a situation that can only do damage to the OAS, to the Dominican Republic, and to the United Nations itself.

Either way, the appointment of the United Nations team makes absolutely no sense.

In addition, the composition of the United Nations commission by itself was bound to bring it into basic conflict with the peacemaking efforts of the OAS.

The representative of the Secretary General, Mr. Jose Antonio Meyobre, a Venezuelan economist, has a lifelong record of association with various radical movements. He is an old personal friend of Juan Bosch, and just about as far to the left of center in his personal views. The best that may be said about him is that he is like Bosch, the kind of non-Communist radical who refuses to condemn communism or to take a stand against it.

Mayobre's chief assistant, Cesar Ortiz, a Mexican, has also made no efforts to conceal his pro-Bosch sympathies, nor has he made any effort over a long political past to conceal his strong anti-American sentiments.

The third member of the team, the Indian General Rikhye, served as Commander of the United Nations forces in the Congo.

As I have pointed out, these forces, instead of promoting order, squandered their energies on military actions that only promoted more disorder, and almost resulted in the loss of the country.

Only the reemergence of Moise Tshombe as Prime Minister saved the country from a complete Communist takeover.

These were the three men selected by Secretary General U Thant to report impartially on the Dominican situation.

The original mission of the United Nations team was supposed to be to investigate and report back.

In practice, the team has far exceeded this mandate.

In competition with the OAS group, it has sought to enter into discussions with Dominican citizens with a view to organizing a government that meets with its own criteria.

Recently there has been some evidence of a concerted push to expand the functions and personnel of the United Nations team. Participating in this effort are certain of the Afro-Asian nations, the Communist bloc, and France. This push assumed particularly vigorous proportions after the exchange of fire with the OAS forces, initiated by rebel extremists on June 15. As I understand the matter, the United Nations team rushed to the scene, interviewed Camacho, and forwarded Camacho's version of the events to its headquarters.

So one-sided was the United Nations version that Soviet representative Fedorenko was able to charge that we were

June 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14775

using methods "reminiscent of Hitler's hangmen," while the French delegate was moved to propose that the United Nations should increase the size of its observer team and expand its function.

It is my understanding that the American delegates to the United Nations were extremely indignant over the one-sided report sent back to the United Nations by its observer team.

In the light of the facts I have here detailed, I am more than ever convinced that United Nations intervention in the Dominican Republic has already done grave harm and that its continued presence there is bound to have a further unsettling effect.

I hope that our delegates to the United Nations will do everything in their power to resist any expansion of authority and numbers on the part of the United Nations team.

THE WAY OUT

I would be willing to go along with the most generous measures to help bail the United Nations out of its financial crisis.

But I consider it necessary to state for the record that I am becoming increasingly fed up with the double standard of behavior that leads the United Nations to intervene in situations where effective peacekeeping machinery already exists and where its own presence can do nothing but harm, while it fails to intervene or even to take notice of clear-cut cases of military aggression involving the nations of either the Communist bloc or the Afro-Asian bloc.

I am certain that this concern is shared by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

This is the real crisis of the United Nations, and not the financial crisis.

If the United Nations is again to become an instrument of law and a force for peace, many things must be done.

In addition to creating some kind of mechanism that can protect and improve the United Nations by submitting its operations to periodic scrutiny, it is essential that we ourselves and the member nations who share our values face up to the disastrous erosion of the United Nations Charter in recent years and embark on a campaign for a return to the Charter.

If the Charter calls for "respect for the obligations arising from treaties," the unilateral repudiation of any treaty by a member nation should at the very least call for the unanimous censure of the General Assembly.

If the Charter calls for the "self-determination of peoples," the United Nations should use its moral authority impartially to promote self-determination for the captive peoples of Europe as well as for those Asian and African peoples still living under colonial rule.

If the Charter calls upon all members to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force," this must not be construed as applying only to the Western nations and not to the nations of the Communist bloc or Afro-Asian bloc.

It must not be construed as meaning that India is free to invade Goa, that the United Arab Republic is free to invade Yemen, that the Brazzaville Congo

and Tanganyika, and Tunisia, and Algeria are free to organize and harbor guerrilla armies for operations elsewhere in Africa.

If the United Nations General Assembly is no longer prepared to condemn such blatant use of force or such outspoken threats of force as Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum, then I say that the United Nations has lost a large part of the justification for its existence.

If the Charter prohibits intervention in domestic matters, the General Assembly must abide by this clause, too.

I believe that we must make every effort to save the United Nations as an area of contact between the Communist world, the free world, and the uncommitted nations; as a forum from which we can plead the cause of freedom and solicit the support of the world community for the objectives of our foreign policy; as a medium for the conciliation of disputes; as a vehicle for cooperative nonpolitical activities like the World Health Organization; as an organization whose functions may be progressively enlarged if the world situation improves.

The United Nations can be saved, and should be saved.

The United Nations will not be saved if we continue to ascribe to it virtues which it cannot possibly possess and assign to it executive tasks that it is functionally incapable of fulfilling.

It will not be saved if we continue to sweep its misdemeanors and weaknesses under the rug instead of airing them frankly.

But above all, the United Nations will not be saved unless we are prepared to provide the leadership for an all-out campaign to return to the principles enunciated in the United Nations Charter, and to give these principles the force of law in the relations between nations.

This, as I see it, is the prime task that confronts us.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was my honor to represent the United States as a delegate to the United Nations in this session. I cannot disagree with what the Senator is saying today. Frankly—I say this as a Senator; I have no privilege to say it as a member of the U.S. delegation—there is a serious doubt in my own mind that the United Nations can succeed in its purposes as a peacekeeping organization so long as it has so many elements in it that are really there for the purpose of keeping it from working.

One can say anything he wishes, the fact remains that the Communist nations do not serve the purpose of the United Nations. The U.N. was formed as a group of nations joining to work together for peace, to preserve the peace of the world, and provide peaceful means of solving international crises.

There is a growing doubt in this Senator's mind as to whether the organization can be as effective a peacekeeping organization of free people as it would be if it were limited to nations that shared similar purposes.

I do not say we should abolish the United Nations, but I doubt whether we

should entrust to the United Nations such peacekeeping functions as have been delegated to it.

It seems to me that if we had to keep the peace an organization of nations that really intended to do just that, and let the United Nations be the debating society which it has always tended to be, we might more effectively achieve our purposes.

The Organization of American States is an organization of states with similar goals and philosophies. There are not the same problems in that organization as there are in the United Nations. The OAS wishes to keep the peace, to see that each neighbor lives within its own boundaries. It wants no aggression, and will brook no aggression. We can in good conscience have the OAS send a commander to command our forces in the Dominican Republic, knowing that the organization has the same purpose that we have. We want to have peace. We do not want to have overthrown any peaceful government, particularly a government that follows the will of its people.

The Senator has made a good argument, namely that the United Nations will have to do a better job of accomplishing the purposes of the charter, or we shall have to find something to take its place in carrying out its functions, and let the organization exist as a debating society, where we can bring together all those who do not agree, and let them debate and debate, without conclusion. Its place may have to be taken by an organization that can settle disputes among nations, an organization that can arrive at a consensus and then get nations to agree to that decision. I regret to say that the United Nations has at times proved disappointing.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful for the Senator's comments. I am sure that he and I and the vast majority of the people want the United Nations to succeed.

Our point is that the way to bring that about is to have it operate as it was intended to operate, by not going beyond its charter, and by not failing to live up to the requirements of its charter. For example, the U.N. should have acted in the case of Yemen. When Nasser invaded Yemen with 50,000 troops, the United Nations did not show any interest. Goa is another case.

In addition, the U.N. must learn that it has no right to go into a sovereign country and interfere in matters which must be settled domestically. That is the lesson of the Congo.

I am grateful to the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution.

FE *WAV Dadd*
BARBARISM IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in a concise, pointed editorial on Monday, June 28, the Hartford Times commented on the execution last week of Sgt. Harold Bennett.

The editorial concluded with these words:

The execution of Sergeant Bennett * * * was illegal, an act of murder. The U.S. Government should promptly and publicly serve notice that every person who had a hand in

14776

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 30, 1965

it will be considered a criminal and so treated, and the word and power of the United States should be pledged to that end.

I agree fully, and ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BARBARISM IN VIETNAM

The Hanoi government of North Vietnam says Sgt. Harold George Bennett, U.S. Army, was executed as "an aggressor who had committed many crimes against the South Vietnamese people."

Just for the record:

Sergeant Bennett, like all other American soldiers in Vietnam, was there at the invitation of the legal government of that country. He was a uniformed member of a regular military force, acting under the lawful orders of his superiors. By international law and age-old custom, he was entitled to humane treatment from his captors.

His execution was in reprisal against the executions of several Vietcong members by the South Vietnamese Government.

The Vietcong is considered by the Government of South Vietnam to be an illegal organization. Its members are legally traitors. The Government of the United States, the U.S. Army, and Sergeant Bennett had no part in the treatment of Vietcong members by the Government of South Vietnam.

The execution of Sergeant Bennett, therefore, was illegal, an act of murder. The U.S. Government should promptly and publicly serve notice that every person who had a hand in it will be considered a criminal and so treated, and the word and power of the United States should be pledged to that end.

NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues, especially the Senators from the lower New England-New York area, an excellent series of three articles that appeared in the Hartford Times last week.

These articles are important and informative not only because they cover the background and recent developments concerning the New Haven Railroad but because the articles go into the possibility of private enterprise stepping in and bringing services back to a high level.

What good private management can do to straighten out a failing railroad is too often left out of discussions and proposals on how to keep the New Haven from going under.

Railroads in worse trouble than the New Haven have been not only saved but turned into profitable ventures by private means.

Why not the New Haven?

I ask unanimous consent to have these Hartford Times articles, written by Don O. Noel, Jr., printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPERTS DISAGREE ON NEW HAVEN RAILROAD SURVIVAL

(Who will buy the New Haven Railroad? Until recently, there have appeared only two choices: The merging Penn-Central Railroad, or else the States themselves. There now appears a third choice: New England private enterprise. In this series, the Hartford Times explores the facts and figures which lead a growing number of businessmen to believe the bankrupt New Haven could make money.)

(By Don O. Noel, Jr.)

Can the New Haven Railroad's commuter operations turn a profit?

"No," says Stuart T. Saunders, chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad, one of the merging Penn-Central leaders now negotiating to run that very commuter service on a contract basis.

Mr. Saunders told his stockholders in May that "there is no way on earth" that commuter railroads, such as the Long Island, and presumably the New Haven as well, can be made profitable.

"Yes," says a brandnew engineering study of the New Haven, made public Monday. It forecasts a profit margin of $\$1\frac{1}{2}$ million a year, including amortization of new equipment and stations. Still more efficiency, it said, could come with gradual installation of automatic fare collection.

This sharp difference of opinion is one of the reasons private, New England interests are weighing a bid to buy the New Haven Railroad, including its commuter service, away from the Penn-Central.

Even before the New Haven Commuter Study Group made its findings public Monday, there were strong arguments on the side of profitable commuter service.

The strongest: the CNW, or Chicago and North Western Railway.

Five years ago, the CNW began a massive development program. Faced with competition from three new expressways, the line spent \$50 million for new equipment, double-deck cars, better timetables, rebuilt stations.

Its chairman, Ben W. Heineman, told a New York meeting of security analysts this month that his commuter operation will clear \$1 million profit in 1965. It has already begun a second, 10-percent increase in commuter equipment investment, and Mr. Heineman said another go-around lies ahead, with indefinite growth.

Mr. Heineman carefully refrained from saying a dose of CNW medicine could cure New York commuter deficits.

But a comparison of the systems suggests it might.

LENGTH OF RIDE

The CNW carries about half again as many commuters as does the New Haven. They must be picked up at three times as many stations as the New Haven's riders. Their average ride is a third shorter than the New Haven average, and therefore theoretically less efficient.

(Penny's Saunders told his stockholders the CNW's commuter profit is largely due to the fact that its hauls are longer than most Penn-Central commuter runs. But the average New Haven commuter rides 30 miles, compared to a 21-mile average on the CNW.)

Despite these apparent handicaps, the CNW operation has been turned from loss to profit. Some of the techniques:

A new fleet of double-deck cars (160 passengers, compared with 110 on the New Haven) cut car maintenance and reduced crew size.

The CNW thus delivers to the city on each rush-hour train the same number of riders as a New Haven train, 650-700. But it uses an average of 3.3 cars instead of 6. With less train weight, less locomotive power is needed.

Greater reliance on nonstop express runs attracts passengers. It also allows less powerful (and less costly) locomotion with less frequent acceleration from stops to running speed.

The CNW uses more efficient push-pull locomotives, rather than self-propelled units. Commuter trains are backed into terminals, so two cars can be left for the evening rush, while the other one or two shuttle back and forth to give frequent midday service.

The result: it costs the CNW \$6.21 for each mile each train runs, and revenue per train-mile is \$6.40, a 19-cent profit.

It costs the New Haven \$15.30 for each train-mile, and revenues are only \$13.30, or a \$2 loss.

COST PER MILE

The CNW's operating efficiency can be viewed another way. The New Haven carries its average commuter 30 miles, one way at a cost of \$1,100 a year. The CNW carries its average rider 21 miles one way, for \$470. That's 70 percent of the distance for 43 percent of the cost.

Could the New Haven do as well?

Two separate studies, in fact, say yes. The most recent, announced this week by the New Haven Commuter Study Group, proposed spending \$15 million for 75 new self-propelled cars, and \$15 million more for new stations, maintenance yards, signaling and engineering.

The study also recommends eliminating commuter service east of Westport, and providing sharply-increased express runs.

The projected outcome: a commuter system whose trains would shave 5 to 20 minutes off present runs to Grand Central, attract new riders, and earn a profit of \$1,580,000 before taxes. Still further profit should be possible, the report said, by developing off-peak (mid-day) traffic, and by gradually automating fare collection.

Much the same result, but with slightly different techniques, was predicted in an earlier study presented the trustees in 1962. It proposed a 3-year program during which the railroad would refurbish its present cars, and gradually install double-deck, 200-passenger cars.

Included in this early study was a similar refurbishing of intercity (long-haul) service, with a bar-galley in each car served by a stewardess, more use of reserved-seat trains, and institution of unitized three-to-four car expresses, running nearly nonstop to Hartford, Providence, Boston, and a few other cities.

The estimated capital cost of such a program was \$16 million, with an \$8 million Government subsidy needed during the 3 years it would take to complete the conversion.

Trustees of the bankrupt New Haven, when presented this early refurbishing program, said they had already decided on a program to trim back the railroad, try to show a profit, and win inclusion of the slimmer, trimmer New Haven in the Penn-Central merger.

Expansion, they said, would be reversing the direction of their trusteeship.

But expansion is very much in the minds of the private business interests, now looking at the New Haven.

No one pretends a glamorized, rescheduled New Haven Railroad will begin making impressive profits right away. The CNW's \$1.2